

N62604.AR.000861
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

FINAL TIER 1 MEETING MINUTES 22 MARCH 2011 NCBC GULFPORT MS
3/22/2011
TETRA TECH

**FINAL NCBC GULFPORT TIER I MEETING MINUTES
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI
MARCH 22, 2011**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Team Members:

Greg Roof	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., Project Manager
Gordon Crane	NCBC Gulfport, IRP Manager
Nancy Rouse	The Management Edge, Facilitator
Lori Deponshay	NCBC Gulfport
Bob Merrill	MDEQ
Jon Overholtzer	CH2M Hill, Project Manager
Charles Cook	Navy RPM

Guests:

Bill Olson	TtNUS, Project Scientist
Juanita Sapp	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., Scribe
Curtis Mills	Aerostar

1. Day 1 Check in (Tuesday, March 22, 2011)

Welcome and Administrative:

- Announcements: The agenda needed to be adjusted due to a meeting conflict for Gordon Crane. Need to move Bob Fisher's items until after lunch break in order to acquire a speaker phone for Bob Fisher to call in.
- Team Check-In/Introductions: Each meeting attendee provided a brief self-introduction to new team member Charles Cook. Each meeting attendee took a turn providing a brief summary of responsibilities and credentials along with a brief personal update.
- Proxies: None
- The action items from last meeting were reviewed. Action items in text page 2 of 5. Bob Fisher will talk about MOA when he calls in.
- Parking Lot Item from last meeting: The strategy for addressing aggressive RIP deadlines. Bob F. will address whether to make RIP dates official and proceed with documents out of cycle. The December meeting did not get lot accomplished due to Bob Fisher having to go to hospital.
- Bob Fisher gave an MOA update, have not heard back from them. The MOA Language looks standard, if State does not have a problem switching EPA to MDEQ.
- Bob Merrill indicated that Jerry Banks said MDEQ is the head agency
- Create new version with new date and create as final. Need within 30 days from both sides. Need LUC boundaries done.

A-0311-01 Action Item: Bob Fisher to redraft MOA and replace "EPA with "MDEQ" (due 3/25)

- Nancy Rouse suggested adding the ground rules to the meeting agenda and review them prior to each meeting. Nancy Rouse read ground rules. A copy of ground rules will be attached to the meeting minutes. The team reviewed the Team Charter, and agreed to change it to allow members to participate by conference call or by other remote means when necessary. Members may also request to reschedule the meeting.

Consensus vote on changing the Team Charter - all team members approved changes.

2. RAB Meeting Review

Nancy Rouse went over the RAB meeting and discussed the time and date for the next meeting. The location for RAB meetings was discussed; all members were ok with the current location. The next meeting date was discussed and getting back on quarterly schedule for RAB meeting and Tier 1 meeting. A discussion was held on considering scheduling Tier 1 meetings in advance.

3. 5 Year Review Update

Greg Roof gave an update on the 5-year review. Site 8 had the only issue, there is visible impact to the concrete pad due to tracked vehicles operating on the pad. Gordon is going to go out and inspect the site to evaluate conditions. This is an issue to maintain the protectiveness of the cap, the concrete cost was substantial, and the operational maintenance needs to be evaluated. The next 5-year review will be more involved, there was not much to do on this evaluation since most sites were in the design phase. Greg R. will produce the final 5-year review once Bob Merrill sends approval letter. Bob M. will send correspondence to Charles Cook, Charles will scan the original document from Bob M. and distribute to the team, Charles will look over the review comments.

4. Tier II Update

Gordon Crane informed the team that Tier II's meeting frequency has been reduced.

5. Five Year Review

Since Bob Fisher connected via a telephone call and did not hear the presentation. The team re-visited the 5 year review. Bob Fisher thought the document looked pretty good. Team discussed the questions from the RAB meeting whether the geotextiles used in the remedy would last forever.

6. NAVFAC

All actions on plan for this year have been awarded. Charles Cook will evaluate anything coming later. Funded modifications with Aerostar include installing groundwater samples, pad repair and maintenance. Funding needed Site 3 remedial action and Site 4 follow on monitoring.

The IR program for NCBC Gulfport has a good amount of backlog. The PP for Site 2 has been funded. The Site 4 plume evaluation was funded. Continuing GRA's will be limited to the 2010 budget and could cut into ERN funding. The impact may be no end of year money.

Bob Merrill stated that as Bob Fisher transitions out of the RPM role for NCBC Gulfport, old documents should be finalized before new documents are submitted. Greg Roof has the Site 3 RI and Site 4 RD. Greg Roof sent the most recent Site 6 report to Bob Fisher. Because the summary did not have comments, Charles Cook should review.

A-0311-02 Action item: Greg Roof to send latest Site 6 long term monitoring report for review. By 3/25

Everyone is reportedly comfortable with long term, no issues with losing funding. Greg will be sure keep on top of the schedule for his projects.

Jon O. presented to Charles Cook the Site 4 Request for Information, 1, 3, 4 and 5 that have been approved but need signature. RFI 2 has already been signed.

Bob Fisher is Tier II link

Discussion followed about when to have the next meeting. If the schedule is reset to quarterly meetings, the remaining meetings for 2011 should be in June, September and December.

These minutes are a summary based on informal notes taken at the meeting. They are not intended as a verbatim transcript and may not have captured everything that was discussed.

The next meeting was schedule for June 20th - RAB, and NCBC Gulfport Partnering - June 21st and 22nd

A-0311-03 Action item; Nancy will email RAB that next meeting will be June 20th.

Conference Call to Set Agenda on May 16th at 2pm Eastern Time, 1pm Central

Greg Roof to set up bridge for the conference call.

Bob Merrill commented that if the Meridian team can't make these dates, they may have to reschedule the Meridian meeting.

7. Review Exit Strategy / Long and Short Term Goals

Greg Roof reviewed the exit strategy

Site 1 – the next upcoming date is the Proposed Plan / Decision Document, which have not been started, the scheduled date will not be achieved. Changed Proposed Plan date to 3/30/2012 and changed the in progress status to RI/FS. Greg will send out new exit strategy. Remedy in place date will be changed to 12/30/2011 MNA for groundwater until NFA

Site 2 - no changes

Site 3 – The Proposed Plan is done. The RI/FS/DD are in review stages and Greg R. is working on incorporating changes and RTC and should be completed next month. The Decision Document date was changed to 9/30/11 and the RIP date was changed to 12/31/11.

Site 4 RD is done, Greg Roof will respond to Bob Merrill comments, the Decision Document date was changed to 12/30/11, and the RIP date will be changed to 9/30/11

A-0311-04 Action item: Charles Cook, to ask Steve Beverly to determine if DD can be signed by the XO by direction. Due by 4/1/11

A-0311-05 Action Item: Jon O. to email Site 4 mobilization date to Greg Roof due 3/22

Site 5 - no changes

Site 6 – has been in LT monitoring. Completed the field work for the latest sampling event, the lab data was delivered late last week.

Site 7 – The in progress status has been changed to RI WP, UFP-SAP document is in review with the Navy chemist, the Decision Document date was changed to 9/30/12

Site 8 - no changes

Site 10 - no changes

Team set agenda for next meeting on June 21-22, 2011.

A-0311-06 Action Item: Greg Roof set up room block and meeting room for next meeting at Holiday Inn Express due 4/30/11

8. Day 2 Check-In (Wednesday, March 23, 2011)

9. Site 2 RI

Greg Roof gave a presentation on Site 2 progress to date. Phase I geophysics have been completed. Landfill gas monitoring was started, but the water table was too high to complete the methane gas survey, which will resume during Phase 2 when the water table is down. The passive soil gas survey has been completed.

The first round of geophysics data showed anomalies that appeared to be buried material adjacent to the pond on the east side of Site 2. Additional magnetometer data was collected by boat showed buried metallic anomalies beneath the north end of the pond. The in-phase component of the EM-31 survey found similar anomalies with same trench lines. The total magnetic field contour map shows how the northern boundary of Site 2 merges with Site 7. Under presumptive remedy guidance, it is assumed that everything in the landfill area is contaminated. Greg R. requested team concurrence on the boundary of Site 2 as shown on the figure in his presentation. Anything left uncapped at the northern end of Site 2 can be addressed by the Site 7 remedy.

Gordon Crane relayed that the story on base was that there are jeeps buried at the site and there does appear to be large buried metallic items but it may not be beneficial to go out and excavate them because the site is going to be capped.

Immediately north of Site 2 is Site 7, which is funded as a separate investigation. Greg R. suggested that the northern boundary for Site 2 be identified as shown in the presentation figure, and possibly do a combined remedial action Sites 2 and 7. In either situation it appears Sites 2 and 7 abut each other and the remedy for these two sites will be a continuous cover.

Bob Merrill suggested that all the disposal cells are at or below the water table. Greg R. commented that in January, the whole cell was probably under water. Greg R. showed the initial definition of the cap extent on a map. There is no intention to install monitoring wells in interior of landfill, which is defined as the blue line shown on the presentation figure.

Parking lot item: Agreement on Site 2 landfill boundary.

The bottom line is that there is strong evidence of waste disposal and that the presumptive remedy should proceed. Bob Merrill asked what type of landfill cap was under consideration; Greg Roof responded that the type of cap was not determined yet.

The passive soil gas survey did not indicate widespread volatile contamination. Bill Olson said that compared to what was found at Site 3, detections at Site 2 were about 1/5th the concentrations. Pine trees can interfere with the TPH analysis, terpenes from organic material can have a similar response.

Greg R. discussed the tasks for phase 2 of the RI. Fill was emplaced over parts of the former landfill reportedly to depths of 6-7 ft. Soil samples will be collected for geotechnical and chemical properties. Tetra tech will do 8 to 10 soil samples in the landfill above the waste horizon. The purpose of this soil sampling is to determine if/how it can be reused in the remedy construction. Samples will be collected in 2 foot intervals to determine if material above the waste is clean. If contaminated, additional samples from shallower depths may be collected. Hand auger borings conducted at the site have found waste material at a depth of 3 feet.

Lithology and geology will be determined from soil borings down to an estimated depth of 40 ft around the perimeter of the landfill. These soil borings will be used to log lithology down to the 2nd confining layer. One soil boring will be advanced in the landfill to identify the top and bottom of the waste disposal horizon. This soil boring will be grout upon completion.

Monitoring wells will be installed on the perimeter of the landfill to monitor groundwater conditions beyond the presumptive remedy. Charles said as long as we want to know if contaminants are leaving the site or not. Bill Olson stated that based on the hydrology of Site 1, there may be a divide where groundwater could be flowing to the west or east, towards surface drainage features.

Bob Merrill asked if we will install permanent wells. Greg Roof said yes they will be permanent and we can also add additional wells if needed. Bill O. showed where the well installed at Site 7 where dioxin was detected was located. Limited dioxin testing has been scoped for the RI, roughly 25 percent of the samples will be analyzed for dioxin. Funding for additional soil samples is available if needed before writing the RI.

Bob Merrill said that right now they do not know which way down gradient it is. Greg Roof said that data from Phase 2 will determine the downgradient direction and that detected contamination will be chased to see where it is going or coming from.

Team is in agreement that the boundary is sufficient to proceed. The blue line on the map is the presumed landfill boundary for further investigation. If during well installation, additional waste is found then the cap will be expanded accordingly. Remedial action has not been funded for Site 7 or Site 2. Potentially, the Site 7 investigation will catch with progress on Site 2 so that they can be funded together. Charles Cook will look into that possibility.

A-0311-07: Charles Cook to look into combining site 2 and site 7 for RA due 4/8

The drainage canal east of Site 2 and 7 might cause some problems for the Site 7 RA.

Bob Merrill asked if there will be an ecological risk assessment and Greg Roof said there would be one done as part of the RI. Greg R. said odds of there being suitable habitat for ecological receptors are not very likely. Tetra Tech is procuring a driller and should be drilling at the site in the next few weeks. Bob Merrill said it would be good to invite Fish and Wildlife to the sampling event to see if they need to offer input.

Bob Merrill suggested that the golf course was built on a retention pond and suggested taking some surface water samples in the pond at the golf course. None of the wells sampled at Site 2 had contamination. One well installed at Site 7 had dioxin contamination in one sample, this result was not repeated in the follow up sample. The well location shown on the map needs to be moved to represent the correct location. This was completed prior to the consensus.

10. Site 4 Groundwater Investigation

The Navy has funded further plume evaluation. Greg R. projected a map of the Site 4 site boundary from 2006 with the groundwater flow direction and vinyl chloride concentration contours. Groundwater flow at the site is confusing because groundwater can go under and into the canal.

Previously a treatability study was conducted with sodium lactate conditioning and bacterial inoculation. Follow up sampling identified significant decrease in chlorinated solvent concentrations after treatment. Not unusual to observe a concentration increase in breakdown products followed by a decrease over time. Funding is available if additional treatment is needed. Bill O. said that when we did the inoculation, adding the nutrients helped stimulate microbial breakdown and Greg Roof stated that for the most part most wells had decreases in concentrations.

Greg R. projected a map to show the landfill boundary and where the cap is being installed. The plume is at the south end of the site. When the plume evaluation is conducted, Greg R. indicated that a well could be installed in the hot spot through the cap, but would like to minimize that, Jon O. said the drainage composite will be 2 feet deep. Greg R. does not recommend a huge delineation through the cap. Greg R. asked Bob M. for input on the locations of additional wells. Another option is to not install wells in the cap and monitor outside of the landfill. The TCE concentrations were not very high. Bob Merrill asked if the source area was identified, Greg R. said they did not know specifically where the source was.

Groundwater detections show that the plume is migrating beyond the cap. It is possible to treat groundwater beyond cap, if we decide to treat at all. Bob Merrill is concerned that the hot spot is close to the eastern edge of the plume. Bob M. asked if eastern edge is well defined. Greg R. stated the plume evaluation has funding to put in more wells. Greg R. asked Bob M. if it was acceptable to not install more wells in the hotspot. Bob referred it back to Charles Cook to make the decision. Greg R. suggested that not putting any wells through the cap, but to go outside the cap. Charles asked if the canal was acting like a barrier. During the RI three or four samples surface water samples from the canal had detections, but groundwater is probably running under Canal 1 especially with the lining recently installed. Greg R. asked Charles to keep this in mind when he gets the work plan. Bob M. indicated that not installing source wells through the cap was acceptable. Greg said that we will monitor the groundwater beyond the landfill perimeter. Greg R. indicated that the work plan will be out soon for the team to review.

11. Site 6

Site 6 was sampled in January 2011. Bill Olson projected a map showing the former fire fighting training area. All the buildings are gone and the site is just a grassy area. Currently there are 8 monitoring wells still on site. The groundwater flow direction has remained consistent over time. Two sampling events (July 2010) ago it was decided to discontinue sampling the 3 wells with free product because they were highly likely to have contamination. Three new wells were installed outside of the product area, and the sampling interval was switched to semiannual sampling. Data show that the COC concentrations fluctuate with the water level. Bill projected a table showing current analytical results, indicating that new wells had no detections, and that vinyl chloride in the other well sampled has dropped about 25% since last sampling event. These results will be reported more formally in the next meeting. Greg R. asked Bill O. if we have ever defined the free product. Bob Merrill said we have been watching for rebound. Bill O. said there was no free product of consequence detected in January 2011. Greg R. said contaminant concentrations have not varied significantly in last year and suggested that the team may want to consider a shift to annual monitoring. Bob Merrill asked if the source had been identified. Bill O. and Greg R. said the fire fighting pits were the source. Greg R. said everything seems stable. Greg R. told Bill O. to make sure to include the information regarding free product in the next report.

12. Round Table Discussion

No outstanding issues

13. Next Tier I Meeting Agenda

The next Tier I Conference Call will take place on May 16, 2011, 2 PM EST.

The next Tier I Meeting will be held on June 21-22, 2011.

The RAB will be scheduled for March 28, 2011.

The next Tier II meeting is scheduled for June.

14. Review Meeting Action Items

Team members reviewed the action items.

Welcomed new partner Charles Cook
Charles getting up on the learning curve
Good understanding of upcoming Site 2 RI field work and Site 4 Plume evaluation
Understanding of Site 3 schedule
Nancy updated Team Roster

15. Plus/Delta

+ (pluses)	Δ (deltas)
Showed up on time Good technical discussions Team engaged and participatory Able to Adjust schedules to meet uncontrolled events Excellent presentation Sidebars at a minimum	Cold room Hot room Fisher not here/gone

16. Review Action Items

The team reviewed the action item list noting completed items and updating information corresponding to ongoing action items (see table below). Shaded rows have been noted as "Completed" and will be removed from the Ongoing Action Items table prior to the next action item review.

Team had a discussion concerning A-0810-02 in reference to the RAB meeting location. Nancy noted that the meeting location did not really seem to affect attendance.

Action Item Number	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0510-02	Debbie Humbert	Ongoing	TBD	Work with Tier II to address EPA CERCLA involvement.
A-0311-01	Bob Fisher		3/25	Redraft MOA to replace "EPA" with "MDEQ"
A-0311-02	Greg Roof		3/25	Send latest Site 6 LTM report to Charles for review
A-0311-03	Nancy Rouse		3/22	Email RAB concerning change in meeting date
A-0311-04	Charles Cook		4/1	Determine if DD can be signed by "XO" by direction
A-0311-05	Jon Overholtzer		3/22	Send info on Site 4 MOB date to Greg
A-0311-06	Greg Roof		4/30	Set up room block and meeting room for next meeting.
A-0311-07	Charles Cook		4/7	Look into combining Sites 2 & 7 for RA